arXiv:1610.08805v1 [stat.ME] 27 Oct 2016

Estimation of the Volume Under the ROC Surface in Presence of Nonignorable Verification Bias

K. To Duc*, M. Chiogna† & G. Adimari‡
Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Padua,
Via C. Battisti, 241-243, 35121 Padua, Italy

Abstract

The volume under the receiver operating characteristic surface (VUS) is useful for measuring the overall accuracy of a diagnostic test when the possible disease status belongs to one of three ordered categories. In medical studies, the VUS of a new test is typically estimated through a sample of measurements obtained by some suitable sample of patients. However, in many cases, only a subset of such patients has the true disease status assessed by a gold standard test. In this paper, for a continuous-scale diagnostic test, we propose four estimators of the VUS which accommodate for nonignorable missingness of the disease status. The estimators are based on a parametric model which jointly describes both the disease and the verification process. Identifiability of the model is discussed. Consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed estimators are shown, and variance estimation is discussed. The finite-sample behavior is investigated by means of simulation experiments.

Key words: diagnostic test, nonignorable missing data mechanism, ROC analysis.

1 Introduction

For an ordinal three-category classification problem, the assessment of the performance of a diagnostic test is achieved by the analysis of the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) surface, which generalizes the ROC curve for binary diagnostic outcomes. The volume under the ROC surface (VUS) is a summary index, usually employed for measuring the overall diagnostic accuracy of the test. Under correct ordering, values of VUS vary from 1/6, suggesting the test is no better than chance alone, to 1, which implies a perfect test, i.e. a test that perfectly discriminates among the three categories. The theoretical construction of the ROC surface and VUS was introduced for the first time by Scurfield (1996).

In medical studies, the evaluation of the discriminatory ability of a diagnostic test is typically obtained by making inference about its ROC surface and VUS, based on data from some suitable sample of patients (or units). When the disease status of each patient can be exactly assessed by means of a gold standard (GS) test, a set of methods exist to estimate the ROC surface and VUS of

*toduc@stat.unipd.it
†monica.chiogna@unipd.it
‡gianfranco.adimari@unipd.it

the test in evaluation. See Nakas and Yiannoutsos (2004), Xiong et al. (2006), Li and Zhou (2009) and Kang and Tian (2013), among others. In practice, however, disease status verification via GS test could be unavailable for all units in the sample, due to the expensiveness and/or invasiveness of the GS test. Thus, often, only a subset of patients undergoes disease verification. In such situations, the implementation of the methods discussed in the above mentioned papers could only be performed on the verified subjects, typically yielding biased estimates of ROC surface and VUS. This bias is known as verification bias.

In order to correct for verification bias, the researchers often assume that the selection for disease verification does not depend on the disease status, given the test results and other observed covariates, i.e., they assume that the true disease status, when missing, is missing at random (MAR, Little and Rubin (2002)). Under this assumption, there exist few methods to get bias–corrected inference in ROC surface analysis. Chi and Zhou (2008) proposed a nonparametric likelihood–based approach to obtain bias–corrected estimators for ROC surface and VUS of an ordinal diagnostic test. In case of continuous diagnostic tests, To Duc, Chiogna and Adimari (2016) discussed several solutions based on imputation and re–weighting methods, and proposed four verification bias–corrected estimators of the ROC surface and VUS: full imputation (FI), mean score imputation (MSI), inverse probability weighting (IPW) and semi–parametric efficient (SPE) estimators.

However, in some studies the decision to send a subject to verification may be directly based on the presumed subject's disease status, or, more generally, the selection mechanism may depend on some unobserved covariates related to disease; in these cases, the MAR assumption does not hold and the missing data mechanism is called nonignorable (NI).

For two-class problems, methods to deal with NI verification bias have been developed, for instance, in Baker (1995); Zhou and Rodenberg (1998); Zhou and Castelluccio (2003, 2004); Rotnitzky, Faraggi and Schisterman (2006); Fluss et al. (2009); Fluss, Reiser and Faraggi (2012); Liu and Zhou (2010). However, the issue of correcting for NI verification bias in ROC surface analysis is very scarcely considered in the statistical literature. This motivated us to develop bias–corrected methods for continuous diagnostic tests with three–class disease status, under a NI missing data mechanism. In particular, in this paper we adopt parametric regression models for the disease and the verification processes, extending the selection model of Liu and Zhou (2010) to match the case of three–class disease status. Then, we use likelihood-based estimators of model parameters to derive four estimators of the VUS. Consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed estimators are proved. Estimation of their variance is also discussed.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we set the working model and discuss its identifiability. In Section 3 we present our proposed bias-corrected VUS estimators, along with theoretical results about consistency and asymptotic normality. Moreover, variance estimation is also addressed. The results of a simulation study are presented in Section 4. Concluding remarks

are left to Section 5.

2 Model for NI missing data mechanism

2.1 Background

Suppose we need to evaluate the predictive ability of a new continuous diagnostic test in a context where the disease status of a patient can be described by three ordered categories, "non–diseased", "intermediate" and "diseased", say. Consider a sample of n subjects and let T, $\mathcal{D}$ and A denote the test result, the disease status and a vector of covariates for each subject, respectively. In this framework, $\mathcal{D}$ can be modeled as a trinomial random vector $\mathcal{D} = (D_1, D_2, D_3)^\top$, such that D_k is a Bernoulli random variable having mean $\theta_k = \Pr(D_k = 1)$ where $\theta_1 + \theta_2 + \theta_3 = 1$. Hence, θ_k represents the probability that a generic subject, classified according to its disease status, belong to the class k. We are interested in estimating the VUS of the test T, say μ, which is defined as (Nakas and Yiannoutsos (2004))

$$\begin{aligned}\mu &= \Pr\left(T_i < T_\ell < T_r | D_{1i} = 1, D_{2\ell} = 1, D_{3r} = 1\right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\Pr\left(T_i < T_\ell = T_r | D_{1i} = 1, D_{2\ell} = 1, D_{3r} = 1\right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\Pr\left(T_i = T_\ell < T_r | D_{1i} = 1, D_{2\ell} = 1, D_{3r} = 1\right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{6}\Pr\left(T_i = T_\ell = T_r | D_{1i} = 1, D_{2\ell} = 1, D_{3r} = 1\right)\end{aligned}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\mu = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(D_{1i} D_{2\ell} D_{3r} \mathrm{I}_{i\ell r}\right)}{\mathbb{E}\left(D_{1i} D_{2\ell} D_{3r}\right)}, \tag{1}$$

where the indices i, ℓ, r refer to three different subjects, $\mathrm{I}_{i\ell r} = \mathrm{I}(T_i < T_\ell < T_r) + 1/2\mathrm{I}(T_i < T_\ell = T_r) + 1/2\mathrm{I}(T_i = T_\ell < T_r) + 1/6\mathrm{I}(T_i = T_\ell = T_r)$ and $\mathrm{I}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function.

When the disease status $\mathcal{D}$ is available for all subjects, a natural nonparametric estimator of μ is given by

$$\hat{\mu}_{\mathrm{NP}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell=1, \ell \neq i}^{n} \sum_{\substack{r=1 \\ r \neq \ell, r \neq i}}^{n} \mathrm{I}_{i\ell r} D_{1i} D_{2\ell} D_{3r}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell=1, \ell \neq i}^{n} \sum_{\substack{r=1 \\ r \neq \ell, r \neq i}}^{n} D_{1i} D_{2\ell} D_{3r}}. \tag{2}$$

However, in many situations not all subjects undergo the verification process, and hence, the disease status $\mathcal{D}$ is missing in a subset of patients in the study. Let V_i be the verification status for the i-th subject: $V_i = 1$ if $\mathcal{D}_i$ is observed and $V_i = 0$ otherwise. We define the observed data as the set $\{O_i = (\mathcal{D}_i^\top, V_i, T_i, A_i^\top)^\top, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n\}$. When the true disease status is subject to NI missingness, estimators working under the MAR assumption cannot be applied tout court. Our goal is to adjust FI, MSI, IPW and SPE estimators discussed in To Duc, Chiogna and Adimari (2016) to the framework of NI missingness.

2.2 Model settings

To deal with NI missing data mechanism, in what follows we extend parametric models adopted in Liu and Zhou (2010) for the two–class problem to the three–class case. More precisely, with three disease categories, we fix the model for the verification process as follows

$$\pi = \Pr(V = 1|D_1, D_2, T, A) = \frac{\exp\{h(T, A; \tau_\pi) + \lambda_1 D_1 + \lambda_2 D_2\}}{1 + \exp\{h(T, A; \tau_\pi) + \lambda_1 D_1 + \lambda_2 D_2\}}, \tag{3}$$

where D_1 and D_2 are defined in the previous section, $h(T, A; \tau_\pi)$ is, in general, an arbitrary working function, and τ_π is a set of parameters. Here, $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)^\top$ is the non-ignorable parameter: the missing data mechanism is MAR if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$; NI, otherwise. As for the disease model, we employ the multinomial logistic regression for the whole sample, i.e.,

$$\rho_k = \Pr(D_k = 1|T, A) = \frac{\exp\{f(T, A; \tau_{\rho_k})\}}{1 + \exp\{f(T, A; \tau_{\rho_1})\} + \exp\{f(T, A; \tau_{\rho_2})\}}, \tag{4}$$

where $f(T, A; \tau_{\rho_k})$ is an arbitrary working function, and τ_{ρ_k} is a set of parameters, for $k = 1, 2$. The parameters $\lambda, \tau_\pi, \tau_\rho$, with $\tau_\rho = (\tau_{\rho_1}^\top, \tau_{\rho_2}^\top)^\top$, can be estimated jointly by using a likelihood–based approach.

It is worth noting that, under (3), an application of Bayes' rule gives that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Pr(D_1 = 1|V = 1, T, A)}{\Pr(D_1 = 1|V = 0, T, A)} &= \frac{\Pr(V = 0|T, A)}{\Pr(V = 1|T, A)} \exp\{h(T, A; \tau_\pi) + \lambda_1\}, \\
\frac{\Pr(D_2 = 1|V = 1, T, A)}{\Pr(D_2 = 1|V = 0, T, A)} &= \frac{\Pr(V = 0|T, A)}{\Pr(V = 1|T, A)} \exp\{h(T, A; \tau_\pi) + \lambda_2\}, \\
\frac{\Pr(D_3 = 1|V = 1, T, A)}{\Pr(D_3 = 1|V = 0, T, A)} &= \frac{\Pr(V = 0|T, A)}{\Pr(V = 1|T, A)} \exp\{h(T, A; \tau_\pi)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\Pr(D_1 = 1|V = 1, T, A)}{\Pr(D_1 = 1|V = 0, T, A)} \Big/ \frac{\Pr(D_3 = 1|V = 1, T, A)}{\Pr(D_3 = 1|V = 0, T, A)} = \exp(\lambda_1), \tag{5}$$

$$\frac{\Pr(D_2 = 1|V = 1, T, A)}{\Pr(D_2 = 1|V = 0, T, A)} \Big/ \frac{\Pr(D_3 = 1|V = 1, T, A)}{\Pr(D_3 = 1|V = 0, T, A)} = \exp(\lambda_2), \tag{6}$$

so that, according to (5) and (6), λ_1 and λ_2 can also be interpreted as log-odds ratios of belonging to class 1 (instead of class 3) and to class 2 (instead of class 3), respectively, for a verified subject compared to an unverified subject with the same test result and covariates.

2.3 Parameter estimation

As in Liu and Zhou (2010), in our model, for simplicity, we take $h(T, A; \tau_\pi) = \tau_{\pi_1} + \tau_{\pi_2} T + A^\top \tau_{\pi_3}$ and $f(T, A; \tau_{\rho_k}) = \tau_{\rho_{1k}} + \tau_{\rho_{2k}} T + A^\top \tau_{\rho_{3k}}$, which is a natural choice in practice. For fixed T and A, the observed distribution is fully determined by the three probabilities $\Pr(D_1 = 1, D_2 = 0, V = 1|T, A)$,

$\Pr(D_1 = 0, D_2 = 1, V = 1|T, A)$ and $\Pr(D_1 = 0, D_2 = 0, V = 1|T, A)$. It is easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(D_1 = 1, D_2 = 0, V = 1|T, A) &= \Pr(D_1 = 1, D_2 = 0|T, A)\Pr(V = 1|D_1 = 1, D_2 = 0, T, A)\\ &= \Pr(D_1 = 1|T, A)\Pr(V = 1|D_1 = 1, D_2 = 0, T, A)\\ &= \rho_1\pi_{10}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(D_1 = 0, D_2 = 1, V = 1|T, A) &= \rho_2\pi_{01},\\ \Pr(D_1 = 0, D_2 = 0, V = 1|T, A) &= (1 - \rho_1 - \rho_2)\pi_{00},\end{aligned}$$

with $\pi_{01} = \Pr(V = 1|D_1 = 0, D_2 = 1, T, A)$ and $\pi_{00} = \Pr(V = 1|D_1 = 0, D_2 = 0, T, A)$. Then,

$$\Pr(V = 1|T, A) = \rho_1\pi_{10} + \rho_2\pi_{01} + (1 - \rho_1 - \rho_2)\pi_{00},$$

and $\Pr(V = 0|T, A) = 1 - \Pr(V = 1|T, A) = 1 - \rho_1\pi_{10} + \rho_2\pi_{01} + (1 - \rho_1 - \rho_2)\pi_{00}$. It follows that the log-likelihood function can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}&\log L(\lambda, \tau_\pi, \tau_\rho)\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big\{D_{1i}V_i\log(\rho_{1i}\pi_{10i}) + D_{2i}V_i\log(\rho_{2i}\pi_{01i}) + (1 - D_{1i} - D_{2i})V_i\log((1 - \rho_{1i} - \rho_{2i})\pi_{00i})\\ &\quad + (1 - V_i)\log(1 - \rho_{1i}\pi_{10i} - \rho_{2i}\pi_{01i} - (1 - \rho_{1i} - \rho_{2i})\pi_{00i})\Big\}. \qquad (7)\end{aligned}$$

The estimates $\hat{\lambda}$, $\hat{\tau}_\pi$, and $\hat{\tau}_\rho$ can be obtained by maximizing $\ell(\lambda, \tau_\pi, \tau_\rho)$ or by solving the score equations

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{D_{1i}V_i(1 - \pi_{10i}) - \frac{(1 - V_i)\rho_{1i}\pi_{10i}(1 - \pi_{10i})}{1 - \rho_{1i}\pi_{10i} - \rho_{2i}\pi_{01i} - (1 - \rho_{1i} - \rho_{2i})\pi_{00i}}\right\},\\ 0 &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{D_{2i}V_i(1 - \pi_{01i}) - \frac{(1 - V_i)\rho_{2i}\pi_{01i}(1 - \pi_{01i})}{1 - \rho_{1i}\pi_{10i} - \rho_{2i}\pi_{01i} - (1 - \rho_{1i} - \rho_{2i})\pi_{00i}}\right\},\\ 0 &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}U_i\Big\{D_{1i}V_i(1 - \pi_{10i}) + D_{2i}V_i(1 - \pi_{01i}) + (1 - D_{1i} - D_{2i})V_i(1 - \pi_{00i})\\ &\quad - (1 - V_i)\frac{\rho_{1i}\pi_{10i}(1 - \pi_{10i}) + \rho_{2i}\pi_{01i}(1 - \pi_{01i}) + (1 - \rho_{1i} - \rho_{2i})\pi_{00i}(1 - \pi_{00i})}{1 - \rho_{1i}\pi_{10i} - \rho_{2i}\pi_{01i} - (1 - \rho_{1i} - \rho_{2i})\pi_{00i}}\Big\},\\ 0 &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}U_i\left\{V_i(D_{1i} - \rho_{1i}) - (1 - V_i)\frac{(\pi_{10i} - \pi_{00i})\rho_{1i}(1 - \rho_{1i}) - (\pi_{01i} - \pi_{00i})\rho_{1i}\rho_{2i}}{1 - \rho_{1i}\pi_{10i} - \rho_{2i}\pi_{01i} - (1 - \rho_{1i} - \rho_{2i})\pi_{00i}}\right\},\\ 0 &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}U_i\left\{V_i(D_{2i} - \rho_{2i}) - (1 - V_i)\frac{(\pi_{01i} - \pi_{00i})\rho_{2i}(1 - \rho_{2i}) - (\pi_{10i} - \pi_{00i})\rho_{1i}\rho_{2i}}{1 - \rho_{1i}\pi_{10i} - \rho_{2i}\pi_{01i} - (1 - \rho_{1i} - \rho_{2i})\pi_{00i}}\right\},\end{aligned}$$

where $U_i = (1, T_i, A_i^\top)^\top$. The above equations are obtained by using the following results

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_1}\pi_{10i} &= \pi_{10i}(1-\pi_{10i}),\\
\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_2}\pi_{01i} &= \pi_{01i}(1-\pi_{01i}),\\
\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_\pi^\top}\pi_{d_1d_2i} &= U_i(1-\pi_{d_1d_2i})\pi_{d_1d_2i}
\end{aligned}$$

(here (d_1, d_2) is a pair in the set $\{(1,0),(0,1),(0,0)\}$), and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{\rho_1}^\top}\rho_{1i} &= U_i\rho_{1i}(1-\rho_{1i}); & \tfrac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{\rho_2}^\top}\rho_{1i} &= -U_i\rho_{1i}\rho_{2i};\\
\tfrac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{\rho_2}^\top}\rho_{2i} &= U_i\rho_{2i}(1-\rho_{2i}); & \tfrac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{\rho_1}^\top}\rho_{2i} &= -U_i\rho_{1i}\rho_{2i}.
\end{aligned}$$

2.4 Identifiability

In this section, we verify that the working model based on (3), with $h(T, A; \tau_\pi) = \tau_{\pi_1} + \tau_{\pi_2}T + A^\top\tau_{\pi_3}$, and (4), with $f(T, A; \tau_{\rho_k}) = \tau_{\rho_{1k}} + \tau_{\rho_{2k}}T + A^\top\tau_{\rho_{3k}}$, is identifiable. Since the log–likelihood (7) is fully determined by the three probabilities $\Pr(D_1 = 1, D_2 = 0, V = 1|T, A)$, $\Pr(D_1 = 0, D_2 = 1, V = 1|T, A)$ and $\Pr(D_1 = 0, D_2 = 0, V = 1|T, A)$, we have to show that such probabilities are uniquely determined by the parameters for all possible T and A. For the sake of simplicity, in the remainder of this section the auxiliary covariate A is omitted (actually, we can always view A as fixed while varying T).

Let $\xi = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \tau_{\pi_1}, \tau_{\pi_2}, \tau_{\rho_{11}}, \tau_{\rho_{21}}, \tau_{\rho_{12}}, \tau_{\rho_{22}})^\top$ be the set of parameters. For given $T = t$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\log(\rho_1\pi_{10}) &= (\tau_{\rho_{11}} + \tau_{\rho_{21}}t) - \log\left\{1 + \exp(\tau_{\rho_{11}} + \tau_{\rho_{21}}t) + \exp(\tau_{\rho_{12}} + \tau_{\rho_{22}}t)\right\} + (\tau_{\pi_1} + \tau_{\pi_2}t) + \lambda_1\\
&\quad - \log\left\{1 + \exp(\tau_{\pi_1} + \tau_{\pi_2}t)\exp(\lambda_1)\right\},\\
\log(\rho_2\pi_{01}) &= (\tau_{\rho_{12}} + \tau_{\rho_{22}}t) - \log\left\{1 + \exp(\tau_{\rho_{11}} + \tau_{\rho_{21}}t) + \exp(\tau_{\rho_{12}} + \tau_{\rho_{22}}t)\right\} + (\tau_{\pi_1} + \tau_{\pi_2}t) + \lambda_2\\
&\quad - \log\left\{1 + \exp(\tau_{\pi_1} + \tau_{\pi_2}t)\exp(\lambda_2)\right\},\\
\log(\rho_3\pi_{00}) &= -\log\left\{1 + \exp(\tau_{\rho_{11}} + \tau_{\rho_{21}}t) + \exp(\tau_{\rho_{12}} + \tau_{\rho_{22}}t)\right\} + (\tau_{\pi_1} + \tau_{\pi_2}t)\\
&\quad - \log\left\{1 + \exp(\tau_{\pi_1} + \tau_{\pi_2}t)\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $x(t) = \tau_{\pi_1} + \tau_{\pi_2}t$, $y(t) = \tau_{\rho_{11}} + \tau_{\rho_{21}}t$ and $z(t) = \tau_{\rho_{12}} + \tau_{\rho_{22}}t$, for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$. The above expressions, which refer to the quantities characterizing the the log–likelihood function (7), can be

rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\log(\rho_3\pi_{00}) &= -\log\{1+\exp(y(t))+\exp(z(t))\}+x(t)-\log\{1+\exp(x(t))\},\\
\log(\rho_1\pi_{10}) &= y(t)-\log\{1+\exp(y(t))+\exp(z(t))\}+x(t)+\lambda_1-\log\{1+\exp(x(t))\exp(\lambda_1)\}\\
&= \log(\rho_3\pi_{00})+\log\{1+\exp(x(t))\}+y(t)+\lambda_1-\log\{1+\exp(x(t))\exp(\lambda_1)\}\\
&= \log(\rho_3\pi_{00})+y(t)+\log\{1+\exp(x(t))\}-\log\{\exp(-\lambda_1)+\exp(x(t))\}\\
&= \log(\rho_3\pi_{00})+y(t)+\log\left\{\frac{1+\exp(x(t))}{\exp(-\lambda_1)+\exp(x(t))}\right\},\\
\log(\rho_2\pi_{01}) &= z(t)-\log\{1+\exp(y(t))+\exp(z(t))\}+x(t)+\lambda_2-\log\{1+\exp(x(t))\exp(\lambda_2)\}\\
&= \log(\rho_3\pi_{00})+z(t)+\log\left\{\frac{1+\exp(x(t))}{\exp(-\lambda_2)+\exp(x(t))}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, assume that there are two distinct points ξ and ξ^* ($\xi \neq \xi^*$) in the parameter space, such that the following equations (with obvious notation) hold:

$$\rho_1\pi_{10} = \rho_1^*\pi_{10}^*, \tag{8}$$

$$\rho_2\pi_{01} = \rho_2^*\pi_{01}^*, \tag{9}$$

$$\rho_3\pi_{00} = \rho_3^*\pi_{00}^*, \tag{10}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. By using (10), the equations (8) and (9) are equivalent to

$$y(t)-y^*(t) = \log\left\{\frac{1+\exp(x^*(t))}{\exp(-\lambda_1^*)+\exp(x^*(t))}\right\}-\log\left\{\frac{1+\exp(x(t))}{\exp(-\lambda_1)+\exp(x(t))}\right\}, \tag{11}$$

$$z(t)-z^*(t) = \log\left\{\frac{1+\exp(x^*(t))}{\exp(-\lambda_2^*)+\exp(x^*(t))}\right\}-\log\left\{\frac{1+\exp(x(t))}{\exp(-\lambda_2)+\exp(x(t))}\right\}, \tag{12}$$

respectively. In (11) and (12) the left hand sides are straight lines. Thus, in order to (11) and (12) hold for all t, the right hand sides must be constants. If these constants were 0 (because $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1^* = \lambda_2 = \lambda_2^* = 0$), then (10) would no longer hold for $\xi \neq \xi^*$ and all t. Alternatively, the right hand sides of (11) and (12) are non-zero constants if $\tau_{\pi_2} = \tau_{\pi_2}^* = 0$. Then, as a consequence, (10) still is valid, for $\xi \neq \xi^*$ and all t, eventually if $\tau_{\rho_{21}} = \tau_{\rho_{21}}^* = 0$ and $\tau_{\rho_{22}} = \tau_{\rho_{22}}^* = 0$. This allows us to state that: if $\Pr(D_k|T) \neq \Pr(D_k)$, with $k = 1, 2$, then the considered model (with the particular choice for the functions h and f) is identifiable, i.e., the joint probabilities $\Pr(D_1 = 1, D_2 = 0, V = 1|T = t)$, $\Pr(D_1 = 0, D_2 = 1, V = 1|T = t)$ and $\Pr(D_1 = 0, D_2 = 0, V = 1|T = t)$ are determined by a unique set of parameters. Of course, this claim can be easily extended to handle the presence of a covariate vector, A.

3 The proposal

3.1 VUS estimators

Let $\rho_{k(v)} = \Pr(D_k = 1|V = v, T, A)$, for $k = 1, 2$ and $v = 0, 1$. It is easy to see, for instance, that

$$\rho_{1(v)} = \frac{\Pr(V = v, D_1 = 1|D_2 = 0, T, A)}{\Pr(V = v|T, A)} = \frac{\Pr(V = v|D_1 = 1, D_2 = 0, T, A)\Pr(D_1 = 1|T, A)}{\Pr(V = v|T, A)}.$$

Hence, we can get, in particular,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{1(0)} &= \frac{(1-\pi_{10})\rho_1}{(1-\pi_{10})\rho_1+(1-\pi_{01})\rho_2+(1-\pi_{00})\rho_3},\\
\rho_{2(0)} &= \frac{(1-\pi_{01})\rho_2}{(1-\pi_{10})\rho_1+(1-\pi_{01})\rho_2+(1-\pi_{00})\rho_3},\\
\rho_{3(0)} &= \frac{(1-\pi_{00})\rho_3}{(1-\pi_{10})\rho_1+(1-\pi_{01})\rho_2+(1-\pi_{00})\rho_3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, we also may consider quantities as

$$\rho_{1(1)} = \frac{\pi_{10}\rho_1}{\pi_{10}\rho_1+\pi_{01}\rho_2+\pi_{00}\rho_3}.$$

Then, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(D_{1i}D_{2\ell}D_{3r}\mathrm{I}_{i\ell r}) &= \mathbb{E}_{T,A}\left\{\mathrm{I}_{i\ell r}\mathbb{E}(D_{1i}D_{2\ell}D_{3r}|T_i,A_i,T_\ell,A_\ell,T_r,A_r)\right\},\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{T,A}\left\{\mathrm{I}_{i\ell r}\mathbb{E}(D_{1i}|T_i,A_i)\mathbb{E}(D_{2\ell}|T_\ell,A_\ell)\mathbb{E}(D_{3r}|T_r,A_r)\right\},\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{T,A}\left(\rho_{1i}\rho_{2\ell}\rho_{3r}\mathrm{I}_{i\ell r}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(D_{1i}D_{2\ell}D_{3r}) = \mathbb{E}_{T,A}\left(\rho_{1i}\rho_{2\ell}\rho_{3r}\right),$$

so that (1) can be rewritten as

$$\mu = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{T,A}\left(\rho_{1i}\rho_{2\ell}\rho_{3r}\mathrm{I}_{i\ell r}\right)}{\mathbb{E}_{T,A}\left(\rho_{1i}\rho_{2\ell}\rho_{3r}\right)}. \tag{13}$$

Equation (13) suggests how to build estimators of VUS when some disease labels are missing in the sample: we can use suitable estimates $\hat{\rho}_{ki}$ to replace the D_{ki}'s in (2). Therefore, a FI estimator of VUS is simply

$$\hat{\mu}_{\mathrm{FI}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{n}\sum_{\substack{r=1\\ r\neq\ell,r\neq i}}^{n}\mathrm{I}_{i\ell r}\hat{\rho}_{1i}\hat{\rho}_{2\ell}\hat{\rho}_{3r}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{n}\sum_{\substack{r=1\\ r\neq\ell,r\neq i}}^{n}\hat{\rho}_{1i}\hat{\rho}_{2\ell}\hat{\rho}_{3r}}, \tag{14}$$

where $\hat{\rho}_{ki}$ ($k=1,2,3$ and $i=1,\ldots,n$) are the estimated disease probabilities obtained from the disease model (4).

Since $\mathbb{E}[V_i\rho_{k(1)i}+(1-V_i)\rho_{k(0)i}|T,A]=\rho_{ki}$, an alternative FI estimator of VUS could be obtained by replacing D_{ki}'s in (2) with the estimates $\tilde{D}_{ki,\mathrm{FI}} = V_i\hat{\rho}_{k(1)i}+(1-V_i)\hat{\rho}_{k(0)i}$. Unlike FI approach, MSI estimator only replace the disease status D_{ki} by the estimate $\hat{\rho}_{k(0)i}$ for unverified subjects. Define $D_{ki,\mathrm{MSI}} = V_iD_{ki}+(1-V_i)\rho_{k(0)i}$ and let $\tilde{D}_{ki,\mathrm{MSI}}$ be the estimated version with $\rho_{k(0)i}$ replaced

by $\hat{\rho}_{k(0)i}$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\rho}_{1(0)i} &= \frac{(1-\hat{\pi}_{10i})\hat{\rho}_{1i}}{(1-\hat{\pi}_{10i})\hat{\rho}_{ki}+(1-\hat{\pi}_{01i})\hat{\rho}_{2i}+(1-\hat{\pi}_{00i})\hat{\rho}_{3i}},\\
\hat{\rho}_{2(0)i} &= \frac{(1-\hat{\pi}_{01i})\hat{\rho}_{2i}}{(1-\hat{\pi}_{10i})\hat{\rho}_{1i}+(1-\hat{\pi}_{01i})\hat{\rho}_{2i}+(1-\hat{\pi}_{00i})\hat{\rho}_{3i}},\\
\hat{\rho}_{3(0)i} &= \frac{(1-\hat{\pi}_{00i})\hat{\rho}_{3i}}{(1-\hat{\pi}_{10i})\hat{\rho}_{1i}+(1-\hat{\pi}_{01i})\hat{\rho}_{2i}+(1-\hat{\pi}_{00i})\hat{\rho}_{3i}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $\hat{\pi}_{10i} = \widehat{\Pr}(V_i = 1|D_{1i} = 1, D_{2i} = 0, T_i, A_i)$, $\hat{\pi}_{01i} = \widehat{\Pr}(V_i = 1|D_{1i} = 0, D_{2i} = 1, T_i, A_i)$ and $\hat{\pi}_{00i} = \widehat{\Pr}(V_i = 1|D_{1i} = 0, D_{2i} = 0, T_i, A_i)$. Such estimates are derived from the verification model (3). Then, the MSI estimator of VUS is

$$\hat{\mu}_{\text{MSI}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{n}\sum_{\substack{r=1\\ r\neq\ell,r\neq i}}^{n} \text{I}_{i\ell r}\tilde{D}_{1i,\text{MSI}}\tilde{D}_{2\ell,\text{MSI}}\tilde{D}_{3r,\text{MSI}}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{n}\sum_{\substack{r=1\\ r\neq\ell,r\neq i}}^{n} \tilde{D}_{1i,\text{MSI}}\tilde{D}_{2\ell,\text{MSI}}\tilde{D}_{3r,\text{MSI}}}. \tag{15}$$

In the IPW approach, instead, each observation in the subset of verified units is weighted by the inverse of the probability that the unit was selected for verification. Thus, the IPW estimator of VUS is

$$\hat{\mu}_{\text{IPW}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{n}\sum_{\substack{r=1\\ r\neq\ell,r\neq i}}^{n} \text{I}_{i\ell r}V_iV_\ell V_r D_{1i}D_{2\ell}D_{3r}\hat{\pi}_i^{-1}\hat{\pi}_\ell^{-1}\hat{\pi}_r^{-1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{n}\sum_{\substack{r=1\\ r\neq\ell,r\neq i}}^{n} V_iV_\ell V_r D_{1i}D_{2\ell}D_{3r}\hat{\pi}_i^{-1}\hat{\pi}_\ell^{-1}\hat{\pi}_r^{-1}}. \tag{16}$$

Clearly, the estimates $\hat{\pi}_i$ also arise from the selection model (3).

The last estimator is the pseudo doubly robust (PDR) estimator. We define

$$D_{ki,\text{PDR}} = \frac{V_iD_{ki}}{\pi_i} - \frac{\rho_{k(0)i}(V_i-\pi_i)}{\pi_i}.$$

An estimated version, $\tilde{D}_{ki,\text{PDR}}$, is obtained by entering the estimates $\hat{\pi}_i$ and $\hat{\rho}_{k(0)i}$ in the expression above. Then, the PDR estimator of VUS is

$$\hat{\mu}_{\text{PDR}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{n}\sum_{\substack{r=1\\ r\neq\ell,r\neq i}}^{n} \text{I}_{i\ell r}\tilde{D}_{1i,\text{PDR}}\tilde{D}_{2\ell,\text{PDR}}\tilde{D}_{3r,\text{PDR}}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{n}\sum_{\substack{r=1\\ r\neq\ell,r\neq i}}^{n} \tilde{D}_{1i,\text{PDR}}\tilde{D}_{2\ell,\text{PDR}}\tilde{D}_{3r,\text{PDR}}}. \tag{17}$$

The PDR estimator has the same nature as the SPE estimator discussed in To Duc, Chiogna and Adimari (2016) under MAR assumption. However, under NI missing data mechanism it no longer has the doubly robust property. In fact, correct specification of both the verification model and the disease model is required for the PDR estimator to be consistent.

Note that all VUS estimators basically require maximum likelihood estimates of the parameters λ, τ_π and τ_ρ of the working models (3) and (4).

3.2 Asymptotic behavior

Let $\xi = (\lambda^\top, \tau_\pi^\top, \tau_\rho^\top)^\top$ be the nuisance parameter. Observe that the proposed VUS estimators can be found as solutions of appropriate estimating equations (solved along with the score equations). The estimating functions for FI, MSI, IPW and PDR estimators have generic term (corresponding to a generic triplet of sample units), respectively,

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{i\ell r,\mathrm{FI}}(\mu,\xi) &= \rho_{1i}(\tau_\rho)\rho_{2\ell}(\tau_\rho)\rho_{3r}(\tau_\rho)\,(I_{i\ell r}-\mu)\,,\\
G_{i\ell r,\mathrm{MSI}}(\mu,\xi) &= D_{1i,\mathrm{MSI}}(\xi)D_{2\ell,\mathrm{MSI}}(\xi)D_{3r,\mathrm{MSI}}(\xi)\,(I_{i\ell r}-\mu)\,,\\
G_{i\ell r,\mathrm{IPW}}(\mu,\xi) &= \frac{V_iV_\ell V_r D_{1i}D_{2\ell}D_{3r}}{\pi_i(\xi)\pi_\ell(\xi)\pi_k(\xi)}\,(I_{i\ell r}-\mu)\,,\\
G_{i\ell r,\mathrm{PDR}}(\mu,\xi) &= D_{1i,\mathrm{PDR}}(\xi)D_{2\ell,\mathrm{PDR}}(\xi)D_{3r,\mathrm{PDR}}(\xi)\,(I_{i\ell r}-\mu)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

In the following, we will use the general notation $G_{i\ell r,*}(\mu,\xi)$, where the star stands for FI, MSI, IPW and PDR.

Recall that the nuisance parameter ξ is estimated by maximizing the log–likelihood function (7). Let $\mathcal{S}_i(\xi)$ be the i–th subject's contribution to the score function, and $\mathcal{I}(\xi) = -\mathbb{E}\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi^\top}\mathcal{S}_i(\xi)$ the Fisher information matrix for ξ. To give general theoretical results, we assume standard regularity conditions, which ensure consistency and asymptotic normality of the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\xi}$. Let μ_0 be the true VUS value, and $\xi_0 = (\lambda_0^\top, \tau_{0\pi}^\top, \tau_{0\rho}^\top)^\top$ the true value of ξ. We also assume that:

(C1) The U–process

$$U_{n,*}(\mu,\xi) = \sqrt{n}\,\{G_*(\mu,\xi) - e_*(\mu,\xi)\}$$

is stochastically equicontinuous, where

$$\begin{aligned}
G_*(\mu,\xi) &= \frac{1}{6n(n-1)(n-2)}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{n}\sum_{\substack{r=1\\ r\neq\ell,r\neq i}}^{n}\Big\{G_{i\ell r,*}(\mu,\xi)+G_{ir\ell,*}(\mu,\xi)\\
&\quad + G_{\ell ir,*}(\mu,\xi)+G_{\ell ri,*}(\mu,\xi)+G_{ri\ell,*}(\mu,\xi)+G_{r\ell i,*}(\mu,\xi)\Big\}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
e_*(\mu,\xi) &= \frac{1}{6}\mathbb{E}\Big\{G_{i\ell r,*}(\mu,\xi)+G_{ir\ell,*}(\mu,\xi)+G_{\ell ir,*}(\mu,\xi)+G_{\ell ri,*}(\mu,\xi)\\
&\quad + G_{ri\ell,*}(\mu,\xi)+G_{r\ell i,*}(\mu,\xi)\Big\};
\end{aligned}$$

(C2) $e_*(\mu,\xi)$ is differentiable in (μ,ξ), and $\left.\frac{\partial e_*(\mu,\xi_0)}{\partial\mu}\right|_{\mu=\mu_0} \neq 0$;

(C3) $G_*(\mu,\xi)$ and $\frac{\partial G_*(\mu,\xi)}{\partial\xi^\top}$ converges uniformly (in probability) to $e_*(\mu,\xi)$ and $\frac{\partial e_*(\mu,\xi)}{\partial\xi^\top}$, respectively.

Then, we prove consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed estimators.

Theorem 1 (Consistency)**.** *Suppose that conditions (C1)–(C3) hold, along with standard regularity conditions for the likelihood function (as those given by Newey and McFadden (1994)). Under the verification model (3) and the disease model (4),* $\hat{\mu}_* \xrightarrow{p} \mu_0$.

Proof. We can show that $\mathbb{E}\{G_{i\ell r,*}(\mu_0, \xi_0)\} = 0$ (see the Appendix). Then $e_*(\mu_0, \xi_0) = 0$, and, by condition (C2) and an application of implicit function theorem, there exists a neighborhood of ξ_0 in which a continuously differentiable function, $m(\xi)$, is uniquely defined such that $m(\xi_0) = \mu_0$ and $e_*(m(\xi), \xi) = 0$. Since the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\xi}$ is consistent, i.e., $\hat{\xi} \xrightarrow{p} \xi_0$, we have that $\tilde{\mu}_* = m(\hat{\xi}) \xrightarrow{p} \mu_0$. On the other hand, $G_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) = 0$ and condition (C3) implies that $e_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) \xrightarrow{p} 0$. Thus, $\hat{\mu}_* \xrightarrow{p} \tilde{\mu}_*$. □

Next we establish the asymptotic normality of the estimators $\hat{\mu}_*$.

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic normality)**.** *Suppose the conditions in Theorem 1 are satisfied. If the verification model (3) and the disease model (4) hold, then*

$$\sqrt{n}\,(\hat{\mu}_* - \mu_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Lambda_*),$$

where the star indicates FI, MSI, IPW, PDR, and Λ_* *is a suitable value.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sqrt{n} G_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) \\ 0 &= \sqrt{n} G_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) + \sqrt{n} e_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) - \sqrt{n} e_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $e_*(\mu_0, \xi_0) = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sqrt{n} G_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) + \sqrt{n} e_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) - \sqrt{n} e_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) + \sqrt{n} e_*(\mu_0, \xi_0) - \sqrt{n} e_*(\mu_0, \xi_0) \\ &= \sqrt{n} \left\{ G_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) - e_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) \right\} + \sqrt{n} \left\{ e_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) - e_*(\mu_0, \xi_0) \right\} + \sqrt{n} e_*(\mu_0, \xi_0) \\ &\quad - \sqrt{n} G_*(\mu_0, \xi_0) + \sqrt{n} G_*(\mu_0, \xi_0) \\ &= \left[\sqrt{n} \left\{ G_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) - e_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) \right\} - \sqrt{n} \left\{ G_*(\mu_0, \xi_0) - e_*(\mu_0, \xi_0) \right\} \right] \\ &\quad + \sqrt{n} \left\{ e_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) - e_*(\mu_0, \xi_0) \right\} + \sqrt{n} G_*(\mu_0, \xi_0). \end{aligned}$$

Condition (C1) implies that the first term in right hand side of the last identity is $o_p(1)$. Using the Taylor expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= o_p(1) + \sqrt{n} \left\{ e_*(\hat{\mu}_*, \hat{\xi}) - e_*(\mu_0, \xi_0) \right\} + \sqrt{n} G_*(\mu_0, \xi_0) \\ &= o_p(1) + \sqrt{n}(\hat{\mu}_* - \mu_0) \frac{\partial e_*(\mu, \xi_0)}{\partial \mu} \bigg|_{\mu=\mu_0} + \sqrt{n}(\hat{\xi} - \xi_0) \frac{\partial e_*(\mu_0, \xi)}{\partial \xi^\top} \bigg|_{\xi=\xi_0} + \sqrt{n} G_*(\mu_0, \xi_0). \quad (18) \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to show that

$$\left.\frac{\partial e_*(\mu,\xi_0)}{\partial \mu}\right|_{\mu=\mu_0} = -\Pr(D_1=1)\Pr(D_2=1)\Pr(D_3=1) = -\theta_1\theta_2\theta_3.$$

By standard results on the limit distribution of U-statistics (van der Vaart, 2000, Theorem 12.3, Chap. 12),

$$\sqrt{n}U_{n,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) = \sqrt{n}\left\{G_*(\mu_0,\xi_0) - e_*(\mu_0,\xi_0)\right\} = \sqrt{n}G_*(\mu_0,\xi_0) \xrightarrow{p} \sqrt{n}\tilde{G}_*(\mu_0,\xi_0),$$

where $\sqrt{n}\tilde{G}_*(\mu,\xi)$ is the projection of $U_{n,*}$ onto the set of all statistics of the form $\sum_{i=1}^{n} B_i(X_i)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{n}\tilde{G}_n(\mu,\xi) &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\Big\{G_{i\ell r,*}(\mu,\xi) + G_{ir\ell,*}(\mu,\xi) + G_{\ell ir,*}(\mu,\xi) \\ &\quad + G_{\ell ri,*}(\mu,\xi) + G_{ri\ell,*}(\mu,\xi) + G_{r\ell i,*}(\mu,\xi)\big|O_i\Big\}\end{aligned}$$

for $\ell \neq i$ and $r \neq \ell, r \neq i$. For the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\xi}$, we can write

$$\sqrt{n}\left(\hat{\xi}-\xi_0\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\left[-\left.\frac{\partial \mathbb{E}\left\{\mathcal{S}_i(\xi)\right\}}{\partial \xi^\top}\right|_{\xi=\xi_0}\right]^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathcal{S}_i(\xi_0) + o_p(1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathcal{I}(\xi)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathcal{S}_i(\xi_0) + o_p(1).$$

Hence, from (18),

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_1\theta_2\theta_3\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mu}_*-\mu_0) &= o_p(1) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\left.\frac{\partial e_*(\mu_0,\xi)}{\partial \xi^\top}\right|_{\xi=\xi_0}\mathcal{I}(\xi)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathcal{S}_i(\xi_0) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\Big\{G_{i\ell r,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) + G_{ir\ell,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) + G_{\ell ir,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) \\ &\quad + G_{\ell ri,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) + G_{ri\ell,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) + G_{r\ell i,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0)\big|O_i\Big\} \\ &= o_p(1) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\left.\frac{\partial e_*(\mu_0,\xi)}{\partial \xi^\top}\right|_{\xi=\xi_0}\mathcal{I}(\xi)^{-1}\mathcal{S}_i(\xi_0)\right. \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\Big\{G_{i\ell r,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) + G_{ir\ell,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) + G_{\ell ir,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) \\ &\quad \left. + G_{\ell ri,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) + G_{ri\ell,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) + G_{r\ell i,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0)\big|O_i\Big\}\right] \qquad (19) \\ &= o_p(1) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}Q_{i,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) = o_p(1) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}Q_*(\mu_0,\xi_0).\end{aligned}$$

Note that the observed data O_i are i.i.d, then $Q_{i,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0)$ are also i.i.d. In addition, we easily show that

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \mathbb{E}\Bigg[\mathbb{E}\Big\{G_{i\ell r,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) + G_{ir\ell,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) + G_{\ell ir,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) + G_{\ell ri,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) \\ &\quad + G_{ri\ell,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0) + G_{r\ell i,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0)\big|O_i\Big\}\Bigg].\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{E}\{Q_{i,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0)\}=0$, and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}Q_*(\mu_0,\xi_0)\xrightarrow{d}\mathcal{N}(0,\mathbb{V}\text{ar}\{Q_{i,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0)\})$ by the Central Limit Theorem. It follows that

$$\sqrt{n}\,(\hat{\mu}_*-\mu_0)\xrightarrow{d}\mathcal{N}\,(0,\Lambda_*)\,,$$

where

$$\Lambda_*=\frac{\mathbb{V}\text{ar}\,\{Q_{i,*}(\mu_0,\xi_0)\}}{\theta_1^2\theta_2^2\theta_3^2}.$$

□

It is worth noting that the assumed regularity conditions for the likelihood and condition (C1)–(C3) hold in our working model, which is based on (3), with $h(T,A;\tau_\pi)=\tau_{\pi_1}+\tau_{\pi_2}T+A^\top\tau_{\pi_3}$, and (4), with $f(T,A;\tau_{\rho_k})=\tau_{\rho_{1k}}+\tau_{\rho_{2k}}T+A^\top\tau_{\rho_{3k}}$.

3.3 Variance estimation

Under condition (C3), a consistent estimator of Λ_* can be obtained as

$$\hat{\Lambda}_*=\frac{\mathbb{V}\text{ar}\left\{\hat{Q}_{i,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})\right\}}{\hat{\theta}_{1,*}^2\hat{\theta}_{2,*}^2\hat{\theta}_{3,*}^2}=\frac{\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{i=1}^n\hat{Q}_{i,*}^2(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})}{\hat{\theta}_{1,*}^2\hat{\theta}_{2,*}^2\hat{\theta}_{3,*}^2},\tag{20}$$

where $\hat{\theta}_{k,*}$ are the estimates of the disease probabilities, θ_k for $k=1,2,3$. Specifically, $\hat{\theta}_{k,\text{FI}}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\hat{\rho}_{ki}$, $\hat{\theta}_{k,\text{MSI}}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\tilde{D}_{ki,\text{MSI}}$, $\hat{\theta}_{k,\text{IPW}}=\sum_{i=1}^n V_iD_{ki}\hat{\pi}_i^{-1}/\sum_{i=1}^n V_i\hat{\pi}_i^{-1}$ and $\hat{\theta}_{k,\text{PDR}}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\tilde{D}_{ki,\text{PDR}}$.

According to (19), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{Q}_{i,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi}) &= \left\{\frac{1}{(n-1)(n-2)}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{\substack{\ell=1\\\ell\neq i}}^n\sum_{\substack{r=1\\r\neq\ell,r\neq i}}^n\frac{\partial G_{i\ell r,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\xi)}{\partial\xi^\top}\Big|_{\xi=\hat{\xi}}\right\}\left\{-\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{\partial\mathcal{S}_i(\xi)}{\partial\xi^\top}\Big|_{\xi=\hat{\xi}}\right\}^{-1}\mathcal{S}_i(\hat{\xi})\\&\quad+\frac{1}{2(n-1)(n-2)}\sum_{\substack{\ell=1\\\ell\neq i}}^n\sum_{\substack{r=1\\r\neq i,r\neq\ell}}^n\Big\{G_{i\ell r,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})+G_{ir\ell,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})+G_{\ell ir,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})\\&\quad+G_{\ell ri,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})+G_{ri\ell,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})+G_{r\ell i,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

In addition, for fixed i, we also have that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{\ell=1\\\ell\neq i}}^n\sum_{\substack{r=1\\r\neq i,r\neq\ell}}^n\Big\{G_{i\ell r,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})+G_{ikr,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})\Big\} &= 2\sum_{\substack{\ell=1\\\ell\neq i}}^n\sum_{\substack{r=1\\r\neq i,r\neq\ell}}^n G_{i\ell r,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi}),\\\sum_{\substack{\ell=1\\\ell\neq i}}^n\sum_{\substack{r=1\\r\neq i,r\neq\ell}}^n\Big\{G_{\ell ir,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})+G_{ri\ell,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})\Big\} &= 2\sum_{\substack{\ell=1\\\ell\neq i}}^n\sum_{\substack{r=1\\r\neq i,r\neq\ell}}^n G_{\ell ir,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi}),\\\sum_{\substack{\ell=1\\\ell\neq i}}^n\sum_{\substack{r=1\\r\neq i,r\neq\ell}}^n\Big\{G_{\ell ri,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})+G_{r\ell i,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})\Big\} &= 2\sum_{\substack{\ell=1\\\ell\neq i}}^n\sum_{\substack{r=1\\r\neq i,r\neq\ell}}^n G_{r\ell i,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{Q}_{i,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi}) &= \left\{\frac{1}{(n-1)(n-2)}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{\substack{\ell=1\\ \ell\neq i}}^{n}\sum_{\substack{r=1\\ r\neq\ell, r\neq i}}^{n}\left.\frac{\partial G_{i\ell r,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\xi)}{\partial\xi^\top}\right|_{\xi=\hat{\xi}}\right\}\left\{-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left.\frac{\partial\mathcal{S}_i(\xi)}{\partial\xi^\top}\right|_{\xi=\hat{\xi}}\right\}^{-1}\mathcal{S}_i(\hat{\xi})\\ &+\frac{1}{(n-1)(n-2)}\sum_{\substack{\ell=1\\ \ell\neq i}}^{n}\sum_{\substack{r=1\\ r\neq i, r\neq\ell}}^{n}\Big\{G_{i\ell r,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})+G_{\ell i r,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})+G_{r\ell i,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\hat{\xi})\Big\}. \qquad (21)\end{aligned}$$

The quantity $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left.\frac{\partial\mathcal{S}_i(\xi)}{\partial\xi^\top}\right|_{\xi=\hat{\xi}}$ could be obtained as the Hessian matrix of the log likelihood function at $\hat{\xi}$. In order to compute $\left.\frac{\partial G_{i\ell r,*}(\hat{\mu}_*,\xi)}{\partial\xi^\top}\right|_{\xi=\hat{\xi}}$, we have to get the derivatives $\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi^\top}\rho_{ki}(\tau_{0\rho_k})$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi^\top}\rho_{k(0)i}(\xi)$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi^\top}\pi_i^{-1}(\lambda,\tau_\pi)$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi^\top}\pi_{10i}(\lambda,\tau_\pi)$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi^\top}\pi_{01i}(\lambda,\tau_\pi)$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi^\top}\pi_{00i}(\lambda,\tau_\pi)$.

In Section 2.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_1}\pi_{10i}(\lambda,\tau_\pi) &= \pi_{10i}(1-\pi_{10i}); & \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_2}\pi_{10i}(\lambda,\tau_\pi) &= 0;\\ \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_1}\pi_{01i}(\lambda,\tau_\pi) &= 0; & \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_2}\pi_{01i}(\lambda,\tau_\pi) &= \pi_{01i}(1-\pi_{01i});\\ \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_1}\pi_{00i}(\lambda,\tau_\pi) &= 0; & \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_2}\pi_{00i}(\lambda,\tau_\pi) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau_\pi^\top}\pi_{d_1d_2i} = U_i(1-\pi_{d_1d_2i})\pi_{d_1d_2i},$$

where (d_1,d_2) belongs to the set $\{(1,0),(0,1),(0,0)\}$. Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\tau_{\rho_1}^\top}\rho_{1i}(\tau_\rho) &= U_i\rho_{1i}(1-\rho_{1i}); & \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\tau_{\rho_2}^\top}\rho_{1i}(\tau_\rho) &= -U_i\rho_{1i}\rho_{2i};\\ \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\tau_{\rho_2}^\top}\rho_{2i}(\tau_\rho) &= U_i\rho_{2i}(1-\rho_{2i}); & \tfrac{\partial}{\partial\tau_{\rho_1}^\top}\rho_{2i}(\tau_\rho) &= -U_i\rho_{1i}\rho_{2i}.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_s}\pi_i^{-1}(\lambda,\tau_\pi) = -D_{si}\frac{1-\pi_i}{\pi_i}; \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial\tau_\pi^\top}\pi_i^{-1}(\lambda,\tau_\pi) = -U_i\frac{1-\pi_i}{\pi_i},$$

with $s=1,2$. Then, recall that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{1(0)i} &= \frac{(1-\pi_{10i})\rho_{1i}}{(1-\pi_{10i})\rho_{1i}+(1-\pi_{01i})\rho_{2i}+(1-\pi_{00i})\rho_{3i}},\\ \rho_{2(0)i} &= \frac{(1-\pi_{01i})\rho_{2i}}{(1-\pi_{10i})\rho_{1i}+(1-\pi_{01i})\rho_{2i}+(1-\pi_{00i})\rho_{3i}},\\ \rho_{3(0)i} &= \frac{(1-\pi_{00i})\rho_{3i}}{(1-\pi_{10i})\rho_{1i}+(1-\pi_{01i})\rho_{2i}+(1-\pi_{00i})\rho_{3i}}.\end{aligned}$$

After some algebra, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_1}\rho_{1(0)i}(\xi) &= \frac{1}{z^2}\left[-\pi_{10i}(1-\pi_{10i})\rho_{1i}\left\{(1-\pi_{01i})\rho_{2i}+(1-\pi_{00i})\rho_{3i}\right\}\right],\\
\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_2}\rho_{1(0)i}(\xi) &= \frac{1}{z^2}\rho_{1i}\rho_{2i}\pi_{01i}(1-\pi_{01i})(1-\pi_{10i}),\\
\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau_\pi^\top}\rho_{1(0)i}(\xi) &= -\frac{U_i}{z^2}\rho_{1i}(1-\pi_{10i})\left\{\rho_{2i}(1-\pi_{01i})(\pi_{10i}-\pi_{01i})+\rho_{3i}(1-\pi_{00i})(\pi_{10i}-\pi_{00i})\right\},\\
\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau_{\rho_1}^\top}\rho_{1(0)i}(\xi) &= \frac{U_i}{z^2}\rho_{1i}(1-\pi_{10i})\left\{\rho_{2i}(1-\pi_{01i})+\rho_{3i}(1-\pi_{00i})\right\},\\
\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau_{\rho_2}^\top}\rho_{1(0)i}(\xi) &= -\frac{U_i}{z^2}\rho_{1i}\rho_{2i}(1-\pi_{10i})(1-\pi_{01i}).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we set $z=(1-\pi_{10i})\rho_{1i}+(1-\pi_{01i})\rho_{2i}+(1-\pi_{00i})\rho_{3i}$, and get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_1}\rho_{2(0)i}(\xi) &= \frac{1}{z^2}\rho_{1i}\rho_{2i}\pi_{10i}(1-\pi_{10i})(1-\pi_{01i}),\\
\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_2}\rho_{2(0)i}(\xi) &= \frac{1}{z^2}\left[-\pi_{01i}(1-\pi_{01i})\rho_{2i}\left\{(1-\pi_{10i})\rho_{1i}+(1-\pi_{00i})\rho_{3i}\right\}\right],\\
\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau_\pi^\top}\rho_{2(0)i}(\xi) &= -\frac{U_i}{z^2}\rho_{2i}(1-\pi_{01i})\left\{\rho_{1i}(1-\pi_{10i})(\pi_{01i}-\pi_{10i})+\rho_{3i}(1-\pi_{00i})(\pi_{01i}-\pi_{00i})\right\},\\
\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau_{\rho_1}^\top}\rho_{2(0)i}(\xi) &= -\frac{U_i}{z^2}\rho_{1i}\rho_{2i}(1-\pi_{10i})(1-\pi_{01i}),\\
\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau_{\rho_2}^\top}\rho_{2(0)i}(\xi) &= \frac{U_i}{z^2}\rho_{2i}(1-\pi_{01i})\left\{\rho_{1i}(1-\pi_{10i})+\rho_{3i}(1-\pi_{00i})\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial\xi^\top}\rho_{3(0)i}(\xi)$ can be computed by using the fact that $\rho_{3(0)i}=1-\rho_{1(0)i}-\rho_{2(0)i}$.

4 Simulation study

In this section, we provide empirical evidence, through simulation experiments, on the behavior of the proposed VUS estimators in finite samples. The number of replications in each simulation experiment is set to be 1000.

In the study, we consider two scenarios which correspond to quite different values of the true VUS. For both scenarios, we fix three sample sizes: 250, 500 and 1500.

In the first scenario, for each unit, we generate the test result T_i and a covariate A_i from a bivariate normal distribution,

$$(T_i,A_i)\sim\mathcal{N}_2\left(\begin{pmatrix}3.7\\1.85\end{pmatrix},\begin{pmatrix}3.71 & 1.36\\1.36 & 3.13\end{pmatrix}\right).$$

The disease status $\mathcal{D}_i$ is generated according to model (4) with $f(T,A;\tau_{\rho_1})=4.6-3.3T-6.4A$ and $f(T,A;\tau_{\rho_2})=4-1.7T-3.2A$. Then, the verification label V_i is obtained according to model (3) with $h(T,A;\tau_\pi)=1+1.2T-1.5A$ and $\lambda_1=-2.5,\lambda_2=-1$. Under such data generating process, $\theta_1=0.4$, $\theta_2=0.35$, $\theta_3=0.25$, and the verification rate is roughly 0.57. The true VUS value is 0.791. In the

second scenario, we generate the test result and the covariate from independent normal distributions. Specifically, $T_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0.65, 1)$ and $A_i \sim \mathcal{N}(-0.3, 0.64)$. The disease status $\mathcal{D}_i$ is generated according to model (4) with $f(T, A; \tau_{\rho_1}) = 4.6 - 3.3T - 6.4A$ and $f(T, A; \tau_{\rho_2}) = 4 - 1.7T - 3.2A$. Then, V_i is obtained according to model (3) with $h(T, A; \tau_\pi) = 1 + 1.2T - 1.5A$ and $\lambda_1 = -2.5, \lambda_2 = -1$. Under this setting, $\theta_1 = 0.55$, $\theta_2 = 0.32$, $\theta_3 = 0.13$, and the verification rate is roughly 0.58. The true VUS value is 0.387.

Table 1 contains Monte Carlo means, Monte Carlo standard deviations and estimated standard deviations for the proposed VUS estimators (FI, MSI, IPW, PDR) in the two considered scenarios, at the chosen sample sizes. The table also reports the empirical coverages of the 95% confidence intervals for the VUS, obtained through the normal approximation approach applied to each estimator. To make a comparison, Table 1 also gives the results for the semiparametric efficient estimator (SPE) discussed in To Duc, Chiogna and Adimari (2016), whose realizations are obtained, in all experiments, under the MAR assumption, i.e., by setting $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$ in model (3). The comparison allows us to evaluate the possible impact of an incorrect hypothesis MAR on the most robust estimator among those, FI, MSI, IPW and SPE, which are built to work under ignorable missing data mechanism (see To Duc, Chiogna and Adimari (2016)).

[Table 1 about here]

Overall, simulation results are consistent with our theoretical findings and show the usefulness of the proposed estimators, which also arises from the comparison with the SPE estimator used improperly. The results also show a good behavior of the estimated standard deviations, which are generally close to the corresponding Monte Carlo values. In general, FI and MSI estimators seem to be more efficient than IPW and PDR estimators. However, for all estimators, acceptable bias levels and sufficiently accurate associated confidence intervals seem to require a large sample size (at least 500, and, prudently, even higher).

This issue of poor accuracy has already been noted by several authors, including Liu and Zhou (2010), in the context of two-class classification problems. In our experience, the trouble appears to arise because of a bad behavior of the maximum likelihood estimates in the verification and disease models. If the sample size is not large enough, the data do not contain enough information to effectively estimate the parameters λ, τ_π, τ_{ρ_1} and τ_{ρ_2}. It seems particularly difficult to get good estimates of nonignorable parameters.

Table 2, giving the Monte Carlo means for the maximum likelihood estimators of the elements of λ, τ_π, τ_{ρ_1} and τ_{ρ_2}, for the three considered sample sizes, allows us to look at the bias of the estimators. More importantly, Figure 1 and Figure 2 (which refer to scenario I and II, respectively) graphically depict values of the estimates of λ_1, λ_2, and τ_{π_1} obtained in the thousand replications, for each sample size. The plots clearly show the great variability of the maximum likelihood estimates at

lower sample sizes, with many values dramatically different from the corresponding target values. With larger sample size, this phenomenon almost completely vanishes, the maximum likelihood estimators behave pretty well, with a positive impact on the behavior of the VUS estimators.

[Table 2 about here]

[Figure 1 about here]

[Figure 2 about here]

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed four bias–corrected estimators of VUS under NI missing data mechanism. The estimators are obtained by a likelihood–based approach, which uses the verification model (3) together with the disease model (4). The identifiability of the joint model is proved, and hence, the nuisance parameters can be estimated by maximizing the log–likelihood function or solving the score equations. Consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed FI, MSI, IPW and PDR estimators are established, and variance estimation is discussed.

The proposed VUS estimators are pretty easy to implement and require the use of some numerical routine to maximize the log–likelihood function (or to solve the score equations). Our simulation results show their usefulness, whilst confirming the evidence emerging in the two–class case, according to which a reasonable large sample size is necessary to make sufficiently accurate inference. In practice, among FI, MSI, IPW and PDR estimators, we would reccommend FI and MSI estimators thanks to their greater efficiency.

The poor accuracy problem seems to be related to an intrinsic difficulty of the maximum likelihood method in providing accurate estimates of the parameters of the disease and verification models, in particular of the nonignorable parameters. Overcoming this drawback is a stimulating challenge and deserves further investigation.

References

Baker, S. G. (1995). Evaluating multiple diagnostic tests with partial verification. *Biometrics*. **51**, 330-337.

Chi, Y. Y. and Zhou, X. H. (2008). Receiver operating characteristic surfaces in the presence of verification bias. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. C. Appl. Stat.*. **57**, 1-23.

Fluss, R., Reiser, B., and Faraggi, D. (2012). Adjusting ROC curve for covariates in the presence of verification bias. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*. **142**, 1-11.

Fluss, R., Reiser, B., Faraggi, D., and Rotnitzky, A. (2009). Estimation of the ROC curve under verification bias. *Biom. J.*. **51**, 475-490.

Kang, L. and Tian, L. (2013). Estimation of the volume under the ROC surface with three ordinal diagnostic categories. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.*. **62**, 39-51.

Li, J. and Zhou, X. H. (2009). Nonparametric and semiparametric estimation of the three way receiver operating characteristic surface. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*. **139**, 4133-4142.

Little, R. J. and Rubin, D. B. (2002). *Statistical analysis with missing data*. John Wiley & Sons.

Liu, D. and Zhou, X. H. (2010). A model for adjusting for nonignorable verification bias in estimation of the ROC curve and its area with likelihood-based approach. *Biometrics*. **66**, 1119-1128.

Nakas, C. T. and Yiannoutsos, C. T. (2004). Ordered multiple-class ROC analysis with continuous measurements. *Stat. Med.*. **23**, 3437-3449.

Newey, W. K. and McFadden, D. (1994). Large sample estimation and hypothesis testing. *Handbook of econometrics*. **4**, 2111–2245.

Rotnitzky, A., Faraggi, D., and Schisterman, E. (2006). Doubly robust estimation of the area under the receiver-operating characteristic curve in the presence of verification bias. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*. **101**, 1276-1288.

Scurfield, B. K. (1996). Multiple-event forced-choice tasks in the theory of signal detectability. *J. Math. Psych.*. **40**, 253-269.

To Duc, K., Chiogna, M., and Adimari, G. (2016). Bias-corrected methods for estimating the receiver operating characteristic surface of continuous diagnostic tests. *Elec. J. Stat.*. In Press.

van der Vaart, A. W. (2000). *Asymptotic statistics*. Cambridge University Press.

Xiong, C., van Belle, G., Miller, J. P., and Morris, J. C. (2006). Measuring and estimating diagnostic accuracy when there are three ordinal diagnostic groups. *Stat. Med.*. **25**, 1251-1273.

Zhou, X. H. and Castelluccio, P. (2003). Nonparametric analysis for the ROC areas of two diagnostic tests in the presence of nonignorable verification bias. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*. **115**, 193-213.

Zhou, X. H. and Castelluccio, P. (2004). Adjusting for non-ignorable verification bias in clinical studies for alzheimer's disease. *Stat. Med.*. **23**, 231-230.

Zhou, X. H. and Rodenberg, C. A. (1998). Estimating an ROC curve in the presence of nonignorable verification bias. *Comm. Statist. Simulation Comput.*. **27**, 273-285.

Appendix

Here, we show that the estimating functions $G_{i\ell r,*}$ are unbiased under the working disease and verification models. Recall that $\xi = (\lambda^\top, \tau_\pi^\top, \tau_\rho^\top)^\top$.

- FI estimator. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left\{G_{i\ell r,\mathrm{FI}}(\mu_0,\xi_0)\right\} &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\rho_{1i}(\tau_{0\rho})\rho_{2\ell}(\tau_{0\rho})\rho_{3r}(\tau_{0\rho})(I_{i\ell r}-\mu)\right\}\\ &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\rho_{1i}\rho_{2\ell}\rho_{3r}(I_{i\ell r}-\mu_0)\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

  Hence, $\mathbb{E}\left\{G_{i\ell r,\mathrm{FI}}(\mu_0,\xi_0)\right\} = 0$ from (13).

- MSI estimator. Consider $\mathbb{E}\left\{D_{ki,\mathrm{MSI}}(\xi_0)|T_i,A_i\right\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left\{D_{ki,\mathrm{MSI}}(\xi_0)|T_i,A_i\right\} &= \mathbb{E}\left\{V_iD_{ki}+(1-V_i)\rho_{k(0)i}(\xi_0)|T_i,A_i\right\}\\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{V_iD_{ki}+(1-V_i)\rho_{k(0)i}(\xi_0)|T_i,A_i,V_i\right\}|T_i,A_i\right]\\ &= \Pr(V_i=1|T_i,A_i)\mathbb{E}\left(D_{ki}|V_i=1,T_i,A_i\right)\\ &\quad+\Pr(V_i=0|T_i,A_i)\mathbb{E}\left(\rho_{k(0)i}(\xi_0)|V_i=0,T_i,A_i\right)\\ &= \Pr(V_i=1|T_i,A_i)\Pr(D_{ki}=1|V_i=1,T_i,A_i)\\ &\quad+\Pr(V_i=0|T_i,A_i)\Pr(D_{ki}=1|V_i=0,T_i,A_i)\\ &= \Pr(D_{ki}=1|T_i,A_i)=\rho_{ki}.\end{aligned}$$

  Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left\{G_{i\ell r,\mathrm{MSI}}(\mu_0,\xi_0)\right\} &= \mathbb{E}\left\{D_{1i,\mathrm{MSI}}(\xi_0)D_{2\ell,\mathrm{MSI}}(\xi_0)D_{3r,\mathrm{MSI}}(\xi_0)\left(I_{i\ell r}-\mu_0\right)\right\}\\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\left(I_{i\ell r}-\mu_0\right)\mathbb{E}\left\{D_{1i,\mathrm{MSI}}(\xi_0)|T_i,A_i\right\}\mathbb{E}\left\{D_{2\ell,\mathrm{MSI}}(\xi_0)|T_\ell,A_\ell\right\}\\ &\quad\times\mathbb{E}\left\{D_{3r,\mathrm{MSI}}(\xi_0)|T_r,A_r\right\}\Big]\\ &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\rho_{1i}\rho_{2\ell}\rho_{3r}(I_{i\ell r}-\mu_0)\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

- IPW estimator. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(V_iD_{ki}\pi_i^{-1}(\xi_0)|T_i,A_i\right) &= \pi_i^{-1}(\xi_0)\mathbb{E}\left(V_iD_{ki}|T_i,A_i\right)\\ &= \pi_i^{-1}(\xi_0)\mathbb{E}\left\{D_{ki}\mathbb{E}\left(V_i|D_{1i},D_{2i},T_i,A_i\right)\big|T_i,A_i\right\}\\ &= \pi_i^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left(\pi_iD_{ki}|T_i,A_i\right)=\rho_{ki}.\end{aligned}$$

  Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left\{G_{i\ell r,\mathrm{IPW}}(\mu_0,\xi_0)\right\} &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{V_iV_\ell V_rD_{1i}D_{2\ell}D_{3r}}{\pi_i(\xi_0)\pi_\ell(\xi_0)\pi_k(\xi_0)}\left(I_{i\ell r}-\mu_0\right)\right\}\\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big\{\left(I_{i\ell r}-\mu_0\right)\mathbb{E}(V_iD_{1i}\pi_i^{-1}(\xi_0)|T_i,A_i)\mathbb{E}(V_\ell D_{2\ell}\pi_\ell^{-1}(\xi_0)|T_\ell,A_\ell)\\ &\quad\times\mathbb{E}(V_rD_{3r}\pi_r^{-1}(\xi_0)|T_r,A_r)\Big\}\\ &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\rho_{1i}\rho_{2\ell}\rho_{3r}(I_{i\ell r}-\mu_0)\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

- PDR estimator.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left\{D_{ki,\mathrm{PDR}}(\xi_0)|T_i,A_i\right\} &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{V_iD_{ki}}{\pi_i(\xi_0)}-\rho_{k(0)i}(\xi_0)\left(\frac{V_i}{\pi_i(\xi_0)}-1\right)\middle|D_{1i},D_{2i},T_i,A_i\right\}\middle|T_i,A_i\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\Bigg\{D_{ki}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{V_i}{\pi_i(\xi_0)}\middle|D_{1i},D_{2i},T_i,A_i\right) \\
&\quad -\rho_{k(0)i}(\xi_0)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{V_i}{\pi_i(\xi_0)}-1\middle|D_{1i},D_{2i},T_i,A_i\right)\middle|T_i,A_i\Bigg\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}(D_{ki}|T_i,A_i)=\rho_{ki}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left\{G_{i\ell r,\mathrm{PDR}}(\mu_0,\xi_0)\right\} &= \mathbb{E}\left\{D_{1i,\mathrm{PDR}}(\xi_0)D_{2\ell,\mathrm{PDR}}(\xi_0)D_{3r,\mathrm{PDR}}(\xi_0)\left(I_{i\ell r}-\mu_0\right)\right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big[\left(I_{i\ell r}-\mu_0\right)\mathbb{E}\left\{D_{1i,\mathrm{PDR}}(\xi_0)|T_i,A_i\right\}\mathbb{E}\left\{D_{2\ell,\mathrm{PDR}}(\xi_0)|T_\ell,A_\ell\right\} \\
&\quad \times\mathbb{E}\left\{D_{3r,\mathrm{PDR}}(\xi_0)|T_r,A_r\right\}\Big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left\{\rho_{1i}\rho_{2\ell}\rho_{3r}(I_{i\ell r}-\mu_0)\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Table 1: Monte Carlo means (MCmean), relative bias (Bias), Monte Carlo standard deviations (MCds) and estimated standard deviations (Esd) for the proposed VUS estimators, and the SPE estimator under MAR assumption. CP denotes Monte Carlo coverages for the 95% confidence intervals, obtained through the normal approximation approach applied to each estimator.

	Sample size	Estimators	MCmean	Bias(%)	MCsd	Esd	CP(%)
Scenario I: TRUE = 0.791	$n = 250$	FI	0.772	-2.4	0.056	0.050	89.9
		MSI	0.770	-2.7	0.057	0.051	90.6
		IPW	0.770	-2.6	0.070	0.061	88.1
		PDR	0.766	-3.2	0.085	0.075	90.8
		SPE (MAR)	0.771	-2.5	0.073	0.138	93.2
	$n = 500$	FI	0.783	−1.0	0.035	0.032	93.3
		MSI	0.782	−1.1	0.036	0.033	93.4
		IPW	0.782	−1.2	0.047	0.042	92.2
		PDR	0.782	−1.2	0.053	0.058	94.0
		SPE (MAR)	0.771	−2.6	0.047	0.040	93.0
	$n = 1500$	FI	0.790	−0.2	0.016	0.016	95.0
		MSI	0.789	−0.2	0.016	0.016	95.2
		IPW	0.788	−0.3	0.025	0.024	94.4
		PDR	0.789	−0.3	0.025	0.024	95.2
		SPE (MAR)	0.771	−2.5	0.027	0.025	89.4
Scenario II: TRUE = 0.387	$n = 250$	FI	0.368	-5.0	0.064	0.057	87.4
		MSI	0.367	-5.2	0.065	0.059	87.9
		IPW	0.377	-2.6	0.084	0.074	87.6
		PDR	0.369	-4.6	0.086	0.075	89.5
		SPE (MAR)	0.346	-10.6	0.063	0.058	84.5
	$n = 500$	FI	0.379	−2.0	0.045	0.041	90.9
		MSI	0.379	−2.1	0.046	0.042	91.3
		IPW	0.380	−1.8	0.060	0.056	91.2
		PDR	0.381	−1.6	0.060	0.053	92.0
		SPE (MAR)	0.345	−10.8	0.044	0.042	76.5
	$n = 1500$	FI	0.388	0.2	0.023	0.022	94.2
		MSI	0.388	0.2	0.023	0.023	94.3
		IPW	0.388	0.3	0.034	0.032	94.9
		PDR	0.389	0.4	0.033	0.029	93.2
		SPE (MAR)	0.346	−10.7	0.026	0.025	76.5

Table 2: Monte Carlo means (MCmean) for the maximum likelihood estimators of the elements of nuisance parameters λ, τ_π, τ_{ρ_1} and τ_{ρ_2}.

	Scenario I				Scenario II			
	True	MCmean			True	MC mean		
		$n = 250$	$n = 500$	$n = 1500$		$n = 250$	$n = 500$	$n = 1500$
λ_1	-2.00	-1.01	-1.76	-1.95	-2.50	-2.09	-2.30	-2.50
λ_2	-1.00	-0.45	-0.87	-0.98	-1.00	-0.99	-0.96	-0.97
τ_{π_1}	2.00	1.25	1.80	1.95	1.00	1.17	1.00	1.00
τ_{π_2}	0.50	0.65	0.55	0.51	1.20	1.39	1.28	1.22
τ_{π_3}	-1.20	-1.24	-1.22	-1.21	-1.50	-1.25	-1.40	-1.51
$\tau_{\rho_{11}}$	15.00	15.53	15.28	15.10	4.60	4.44	4.58	4.66
$\tau_{\rho_{21}}$	-3.30	-3.41	-3.36	-3.32	-3.30	-3.29	-3.33	-3.34
$\tau_{\rho_{31}}$	-0.70	-0.89	-0.78	-0.72	-6.40	-6.94	-6.70	-6.48
$\tau_{\rho_{12}}$	9.50	10.03	9.71	9.57	4.00	4.12	4.11	4.05
$\tau_{\rho_{22}}$	-1.70	-1.79	-1.73	-1.71	-1.70	-1.77	-1.76	-1.73
$\tau_{\rho_{32}}$	-0.30	-0.40	-0.34	-0.31	-3.20	-3.62	-3.42	-3.25



Figure 1: Values of the estimates of λ_1, λ_2, and τ_{π_1}, obtained in thousand Monte Carlo replications (Scenario I), for each sample size. The horizontal lines indicate the true parameter values.



Figure 2: Values of the estimates of λ_1, λ_2, and τ_{π_1}, obtained in thousand Monte Carlo replications (Scenario II), for each sample size. The horizontal lines indicate the true parameter values.